



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/707,117	11/21/2003	Cyril Cabral JR.	FIS920030252US1	1116
32074	7590	06/14/2005	EXAMINER	
INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS MACHINES CORPORATION DEPT. 18G BLDG. 300-482 2070 ROUTE 52 HOPEWELL JUNCTION, NY 12533			ROSE, KIESHA L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2822	

DATE MAILED: 06/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/707,117

Applicant(s)

CABRAL ET AL.

Examiner

Kiesha L. Rose

Art Unit

2822

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 May 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 18-25 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11/21/03.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**

## DETAILED ACTION

This Office Action is in response to the election filed 23 May 2005.

### *Election/Restrictions*

Claims 18-25 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected method of making a semiconductor device, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 23 May 2005.

Applicant's election without traverse of claims 1-17 in the reply filed on 23 May 2005 is acknowledged.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Prior Art (Figure 1).

Applicant's Prior Art discloses an interconnect structure (Fig. 1) that contains a set of active devices connected by a set of interconnect structures, in which at least

Art Unit: 2822

some of the interconnect structures are formed by a conductive material (106) embedded in an interlevel dielectric (112), the conductive material being separated from the dielectric by at least one liner layer (130), in which said at least one liner layer is formed from a liner material comprising Tantalum and Nitrogen in an atomic concentration ratio  $N:Ta > 1.2$  and the liner material comprises  $TaN_x$ , where  $X$  is greater than 1.2. Applicant's prior art discloses the ratio to be 1.2 and for  $X$  to be 1.2, similarly, a prima facie case of obviousness exists where the claimed ranges and prior art ranges do not overlap but are close enough that one skilled in the art would have expected them to have the same properties. *Titanium Metals Corp. of America v. Banner*, 778 F.2d 775, 227 USPQ 773 (Fed. Cir. 1985)

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Prior Art in view of Werkhoven et al (U.S. Publication 2003/0032281).

Applicant's Prior Art discloses all the limitations except for the liner layer to have a thickness of 5nm or less. Whereas Werkhoven discloses an interconnect structure (Figs. 9 and 10) that contains an interconnect structure with conductive material (426) with a liner layer (432) formed of TaN formed on conductive material with a thickness of 2nm. (Page 9, Paragraph 103) The liner layer has a small thickness to occupy less trench and vias to allow for more conductive material and therefore increase conductivity. (Page 1, Paragraph 12, Page 9, Paragraph 103) Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device of Applicant's Prior Art by incorporating the liner layer to have a

Art Unit: 2822

thickness of 2nm to occupy less trench and vias to allow for more conductive material and therefore increase conductivity as taught by Werkhoven.

Claims 4-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Prior Art in view of Chen et al. (U.S. Patent 6,784,096).

Applicant's Prior Art discloses all the limitations except for the liner layer to have a thickness of 0.75 or less. Whereas Chen discloses an interconnect structure (Fig. 8f) that contains a dielectric (806) with a interconnect (816) formed therein with a liner layer (810) that is made of TaN and has a thickness of 0.5nm. The TaN layer is formed of a thickness of 0.5 nm to provide mechanical stability to the dielectric to enhance low dielectric stress migration and electro migration performance. (Column 17, lines 40-54) Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device of Applicant's Prior Art by having the liner layer to be a thickness of 0.5 nm to provide mechanical stability to the dielectric to enhance low dielectric stress migration and electro migration performance as taught by Chen. In regards to the resistivity of the liner being greater than 1000 micro Ohm-cm, the Chen reference inherently discloses this limitation since it is stated in the resistivity is determinate on the thickness of the liner material and since the liner material is 0.5nm (which is claimed) then the resistivity of the liner would be greater than 1000 micro Ohm-cm. (Page 18, Paragraph 46 (applicant's specification))

Claims 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Prior Art (Fig. 1) in view of Werkhoven.

Art Unit: 2822

Applicant's Prior Art discloses an interconnect structure (Fig. 1) that contains a set of active devices connected by a set of interconnect structures, in which at least some of the interconnect structures are formed by a conductive material (106) embedded in an interlevel dielectric (112), the conductive material being separated from the dielectric by at least one liner layer (130), in which said at least one liner layer is formed from a liner material comprising Tantalum and Nitrogen in an atomic concentration ratio  $N:Ta > 1.2$  and the liner material comprises  $TaN_x$ , where  $X$  is greater than 1.2. Applicant's prior art discloses the ratio to be 1.2 and for  $X$  to be 1.2, similarly, a prima facie case of obviousness exists where the claimed ranges and prior art ranges do not overlap but are close enough that one skilled in the art would have expected them to have the same properties. *Titanium Metals Corp. of America v. Banner*, 778 F.2d 775, 227 USPQ 773 (Fed. Cir. 1985) Applicant's Prior Art discloses all the limitations except for the liner layer to have a thickness of 5nm or less. Whereas Werkhoven discloses an interconnect structure (Figs. 9 and 10) that contains an interconnect structure with conductive material (426) with a liner layer (432) formed of TaN formed on conductive material with a thickness of 2nm. (Page 9, Paragraph 103) The liner layer has a small thickness to occupy less trench and vias to allow for more conductive material and therefore increase conductivity. (Page 1, Paragraph 12, Page 9, Paragraph 103) Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device of Applicant's Prior Art by incorporating the liner layer to have a thickness of 2nm to occupy less trench and

Art Unit: 2822

vias to allow for more conductive material and therefore increase conductivity as taught by Werkhoven.

Claims 13-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Prior Art and Werkhoven in view of Chen et al. (U.S. Patent 6,784,096).

Applicant's Prior Art and Werkhoven disclose all the limitations except for the liner layer to have a thickness of 0.75 or less. Whereas Chen discloses an interconnect structure (Fig. 8f) that contains a dielectric (806) with a interconnect (816) formed therein with a liner layer (810) that is made of TaN and has a thickness of 0.5nm. The TaN layer is formed of a thickness of 0.5 nm to provide mechanical stability to the dielectric to enhance low dielectric stress migration and electro migration performance. (Column 17, lines 40-54) Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the devices of Applicant's Prior Art and Werkhoven by having the liner layer to be a thickness of 0.5 nm to provide mechanical stability to the dielectric to enhance low dielectric stress migration and electro migration performance as taught by Chen. In regards to the resistivity of the liner being greater than 1000 micro Ohm-cm, the Chen reference inherently discloses this limitation since it is stated in the resistivity is determinate on the thickness of the liner material and since the liner material is 0.5nm (which is claimed) then the resistivity of the liner would be greater than 1000 micro Ohm-cm. (Page 18, Paragraph 46 (applicant's specification))

Art Unit: 2822

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kiesha L. Rose whose telephone number is 571-272-1844. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-6:00 off 2nd Mondays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Amir Zarabian can be reached on 571-272-1852. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KR  
KLR

  
AMIR ZARABIAN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800